



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to say that the most promising means that occurs to me for bringing about the desired result is through a commission of Mexicans working in conjunction with a commission of Americans who are in touch with American financial interests. They could jointly devise a financial scheme under which American capital could be had to back up the necessary issue of currency, based upon Mexican securities. The American capital would not be forthcoming unless there were some guarantee of a stable Government. The only feasible way to furnish such a guaranty would be through a signed alliance between the United States and the *de facto* Government of Mexico, under which the United States would pledge the aid of its military forces to maintain peace, and under which the United States, with the acquiescence of Mexico, would agree to become responsible for the peace of Mexico in all events until the payment of the contemplated loan.

My knowledge of the weaknesses and prejudices of the Mexican people (and I do not wish to be understood as detracting in any way from their many good qualities) causes me to feel that this latter condition would be the stumbling-block. Every assurance could be given that their sovereignty would be respected, come what may. They have suffered so heavily and so long that they should be willing to make any reasonable concession that would bring them the help which they so sorely need at this time.

If something along this line could be worked out through which the American Government and American capital will go to the assistance of the Mexican people in this hour of their trouble, it would be an evidence of our good-faith and friendliness, and, in the end, would have the effect of allaying to some extent the strong anti-American feeling so prevalent throughout Mexico.

Undoubtedly any suggestion made should have to do with the finances and commerce of the country only, and all matters of government should be left entirely in the hands of the present *de facto* Government. Of course, it would be most advisable to give representation to all factions upon this commission, including the great body of property-owning refugees now in this country (as to these latter, an amnesty act that would invite them home and insure them against persecutions would be greatly helpful).

Much has been said in criticism of the Mexico policy of the Wilson Administration, but Mr. Roosevelt and the other complainants do not come forward with any specific suggestions calculated to clear up the situation. What is needed now is something helpful in the line of what must be done to bring Mexico conditions back to normal. The force and cogency of your writings and the prestige of your magazine, combined, seem to point to you as the logical exponent of a plan by which Carranza may be lead out of the wilderness.

W. C. DOUGLAS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.

IS INDIA LOYAL TO HER MASTERS?

SIR,—There is published an article by the pen of Mr. Sydney Brooks in the valuable columns of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* for the month of April. In answer to that article, I request you to publish this letter in your esteemed magazine, which has stood for justice and fair play between contending interests and causes.

Mr. Brooks writes that "since the war, India has given us not one hour of real anxiety. She has been admirably tranquil, resolute and faithful. Some disquieting incidents, mainly fomented by professional revolutionaries who make their headquarters in California, have occurred, but there has been absolutely nothing to justify the alarmist rumors which occasionally find their way into the American press."

This is absolutely false. The New Defense of India Act, which was passed into law by the Viceroy's Legislative Council on March 18, 1915, was put into operation before the Lahore conspiracy case began. A notification of the *Gazette Extraordinary* of March 24th directed that section 3 of the act shall come into force in the states of the Punjab, Northwestern Frontier Province, and Bengal, including more than one hundred million of the inhabitants of India, and gradually the operation of the act was extended until now it includes the whole of India. Prior to the arrest of a few immigrants returned from Canada and America, 4,185 men had been arrested in the district of Jhung, and since the Lahore conspiracy the arrest, imprisonment and execution of revolutionists have been numerous throughout the whole of India.

Mr. Brooks writes that the trouble is fomented by "professional revolutionists who make their headquarters in California." The object of Mr. Brooks in spreading such misinformation seems to be twofold: First: To bring us, if possible, into conflict with the authorities of this country. Second: To persuade the civilized world to believe that the political unrest in India has been manufactured artificially by the enemies of England or by a few Hindus who have lived abroad, and that it is not a natural reaction on the part of the people of India as a whole against the unbearable tyranny of the British Government.

The truth of the matter is quite the reverse. The British in India are in peril. A correspondent of *India*, a paper published in London, writes from Bombay that "no Englishman is safe in India, and on this account the Englishwomen are preparing to leave India." In the Lahore revolutionary case, which is being tried within the confines of the central jail, Lahore, before the special Military Commission appointed by the New Defense of India Act (which in effect establishes martial law) the Government prosecutor, Mr. B. Petman, says: "In spite of the arrest of the majority of the leaders, the conspiracy continued, and further acts in pursuance of the conspiracy were committed. The police arrested 300, but nobody was willing to testify against them on account of the fear of the revolutionists."

Mr. Brooks states that the princes and the masses are fighting for their King. True it is that some Indians are fighting in the British Army, and a few have volunteered their services. But who are they? They are the Indian soldiers who are part of the British-Indian army in India, whom poverty has driven to enlist under the British Flag. As professional soldiers, whose interest lies in pay only, they are required to fight whenever wanted. Hence, when this great European war broke out, a large number of the Indian soldiers were shipped to Europe who were completely unaware of their proper destination! Some of them thought they were to be shipped from one Indian port to another, while others surmised that they were sailing for Africa!

As regards the rest—who are, by the way, few in number—they are the adventurers and place-seekers. Those few Indian princes who are hanging

around the British camp in France, those "bejewelled" rajahs who are subscribing to the British war-relief fund and aiding in other ways: who are they and what are they? Always lying in the clutches of the tyrannical British, always compelled by brute force to follow at the beck and call of the British, and as such always subservient to the British caprice without any will of their own, and practically prisoners in their own palaces, these Indian princes have been compelled to loosen the strings of their purses to help—as the Imperial mandate has said—a "holy cause for humanity"! Being always watched and suspected and never trusted by the British Government, and politically being absolutely impotent to exert any independent will of their own, these maharajas are doing what they are ordered to do directly or indirectly.

The sentiments and feelings of the masses on whom the crushing weight of British rule falls heavily are not reflected in the actions of these hypocritical opportunists. The masses of the Indian people, hitherto inarticulate, are giving vent to their expression by other means, and gradually are making their voices heard, though hardly an echo of that voice reaches the outside on account of the British "love of justice and fair-play"! At present their voice is entombed by the British censorship established to prosecute a war for "humanity."

Everyone should bear in mind that out of a total of 700 Hindu princes, only five went to Europe. Only three of these went to the front; two fell sick in London, and after six months they all returned to India. On the other hand, two Hindu princes, the brother of the reigning prince of Daspala and the Raja of Kharwa, one of the Rajput States, have been arrested for sedition. The first was sentenced to transportation for life, and the other to two years' imprisonment. Two hundred interned Hindus have been hanged and shot at Lahore, Ambala, Delhi, Meeruth, Calcutta, Orissa, Jhansi, etc. Five hundred have been transported for life, and 5,000 interned without trial, including professors, students, physicians, priests, editors, peasants, social reformers, and soldiers, during the year 1915.

RAM CHANDRA,

Editor *Hindustan Gadar*.

BOSTON ENGLISH

SIR,—In the November number of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* you gave a very clever dialogue on the subject of "Patriotism and Profits, A Conversation About Bonds." The scene is laid in Boston and the *dramatis personae* are introduced in a way to make one eager for the substance of the talk.

To my mind, your reasoning is good and your conclusions satisfactory. Had you laid the scene in New York this letter would not have been written; but as you are now Editor of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, an old Boston enterprise, I venture to call attention to the fact that you attribute to Mr. Worthington language a Bostonian of his type would not have used. At about the middle of page 656, he is made to say: "Our feet are in the water; presumably we will be swimming because we must." And the nephew replies: "But the more we do the more we will help the Allies."

I can't answer for a Harvard graduate of the present day. The use of correct English is not a prominent qualification of college graduates in these